

Applicant : Wray Russ  
Serial No. : 10/820,247  
Filed : April 5, 2004  
Page : 8 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 18496-007001

### REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were pending and stand rejected. Applicant canceled claims 13-16, which were withdrawn in response to a restriction. Applicant added new claims 31-34. Applicant amended claim 9 for clarification. Claims 1-12 and 17-34 are now pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and following remarks.

#### Double Patenting

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-12 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,313 to Russ ("Russ") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,052 to Cummins et al. ("Cummins"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 10 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 7 of Russ in view of Cummins as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,222,800 to Miller et al. ("Miller"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 17-18, 20, and 22-23 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Russ in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,499,841 to Uchida et al. ("Uchida").

Claim 19 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Russ in view of Uchida as applied to claim 17 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,810,153 to Armelin ("Armelin"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 21 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Russ in view of Uchida as applied to claim 17 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,757,407 to Rezanka ("Rezanka").

Applicant : Wray Russ  
Serial No. : 10/820,247  
Filed : April 5, 2004  
Page : 9 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 18496-007001

Claims 24-27 and 29-30 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Russ in view of Armelin. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 28 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Russ in view of Armelin as applied to claim 24 and further in view of Rezanka.

To expedite prosecution, Applicant attaches with the instant reply a terminal disclaimer, which Applicant respectfully submits obviates the above rejections. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 and 17-30 are in condition for allowance.

#### New Claims

Support for new claims 31-34 can be found in the specification at least at FIGs. 14 and 15 and paragraphs 96 and 97.

Claims 31-34 depend from claim 7 and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons that claim 7 should be allowed.

#### Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Applicant : Wray Russ  
Serial No. : 10/820,247  
Filed : April 5, 2004  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 18496-007001

Applicant asks that all pending claims be allowed. Please apply \$55 for a one-month extension of time and any other appropriate charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 8, 2005



Tim H. Pham  
Reg. No. 48,589

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
Redwood City, California 94063  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50308702.doc